(D) Remarks

For purposes of clarity and accountability, the following sequences of brief remarks follows as closely as practical the sequence employed in the Office Action mailed 26 January 2005.

I. All References to "System of Methods" in Claims 19-24 Have Been Changed.

Each of the known instances of "system of methods" in Claims 19-24 (in Amendment B) has been changed in Amendment C to strike mention of "system", as follows:

Provision	Amendment B	Amendment C
Claim 19, preamble, line 1	Page 4	Page 3
Claim 19, Clause (f)(4), line 3	Page 8	Page 7
Claim 20, preamble, line 1	Page 14	Page 13
Claim 21, preamble, line 1	Page 16	Page 15
Claim 22, preamble, line 1	Page 18	Page 17
Claim 23, preamble, line 1	Page 19	Page 18
Claim 24, preamble, line 1	Page 21	Page 20

The phrase, "at System commencement," at Page 8, Claim 19, Clause (f)(1), remains as thus written. This is because that phrase does not refer to the method of any claim. Instead, that phrase simply refers to the term used in the Specification in connection with initiation of use of the invention.

II. All Instances of Use of "/" Have Been Struck, and Appropriate Changes Made to Accompanying Text.

Each of such instances, including instances of "and/or", as enumerated here, have been struck and changed as follows:

Provision	Amendment B	Amendment C
Claim 19, Clause (a), line 2	Page 4	Page 3
Claim 19, Clause (a)(1), line 2	Page 4	Page 3
Claim 19, Clause (d)(2), line 2	Page 7	Page 6
Claim 19, Clause (d)(3), line 1	Page 7	Page 6
Claim 19, Clause (d)(4), line 1	Page 7	Page 6
Claim 19, Clause (e), line 1	Page 7	Page 6
Claim 19, Clause (e)(1), line 4	Page 7	Page 6
Claim 19, Clause (e)(2), line 2	Page 8	Page 7
Claim 19, Clause (e)(2), line 2	Page 8	Page 7
Claim 19, Clause (f)(7), line 6	Page 9	Page 8
Claim 19, Clause (g)(2), line 1	Page 11	Page 10
Claim 19, Clause (g)(3), line 1	Page 11	Page 10
Claim 19, Clause (j)(1)(a), line 1	Page 14	Page 12
Claim 20, Clause (a)(1), line 6	Page 15	Page 14
Claim 20, Clause (a)(3), line 1	Page 15	Page 14
Claim 20, Clause (a)(4), line 2	Page 15	Page 14
Claim 21, Clause (a)(2)(a), line 1	Page 17	Page 16
Claim 21, Clause (a)(2)(b), line 2	Page 17	Page 16
Claim 21, Clause (b)(6), line 4	Page 18	Page 17
Claim 22, Clause (a), line 2	Page 19	Page 18
Claim 22, Clause (b), line 3	Page 19	Page 18
Claim 22, Clause (c), line 3	Page 19	Page 18
Claim 23, Clause (d), line 6	Page 20	Page 19
Claim 24, Clause (a), lines 3-4	Page 21	Page 20
Claim 24, Clause (b), lines 2-3	Page 21	Page 20

III. The Only Instance of Run-Together Words, "Identifierdata", at Page 5, Claim 19, Clause (b)(6)(b), Has Been Corrected.

See Amendment C, Page 4, above.

IV. All Instances of "This Claim" and of "This Method" Have Been Struck and Changed.

All such instances were as follows:

Provision	Amendment B	Amendment C
Claim 19, Clause (c)(4), lines 1-2	Page 6	Page 5
Claim 19, Clause (c)(4), line 8	Page 6	Page 5
Claim 19, Clause (f)(2), lines 2-3	Page 8	Page 7
Claim 19, Clause (f)(4), line 3	Page 8	Page 7
Claim 19, Clause (f)(6), line 3	Page 9	Page 8
Claim 19, Clause (i)(6), line 3	Page 13	Page 12
Claim 20, Clause (b)(5), line 2	Page 16	Page 15
Claim 21, Clause (a)(3), lines 5-6	Page 17	Page 16

V. The Two Instances of Latin Word or Phrase Have Been Struck and Changed.

These two instances were as follows:

Provision	Amendment B	Amendment C
Claim 19, Clause (f)(6), line 3	Page 9	Page 8
Claim 19, Clause (h)(1), line 3	Page 11	Page 10

VI. All Instances of the Abbreviation, "e.g.", Have Been Struck and Changed.

These three instances were as follows:

Provision	Amendment B	Amendment C
Claim 19, Clause (i)(6), line 2	Page 13	Page 12
Claim 21, Clause (b)(2), line 2	Page 17	Page 16
Claim 23, Clause (g), line 2	Page 20	Page 19

VII. Language Following the Last Claim, Not Part of That Claim, Has Been Placed in a Separate Section, on a Separate Page Following Said Last Claim.

See Amendment C, Section C, above.

Conclusion

Based upon Amendment C, and the following Remarks, above, as well as upon the previously filed Amendment B and its Remarks, Joint Inventors Scott A. Heimermann and Stephen Danforth assert that their invention, as described in the currently amended Claims 19-24 of Amendment C, satisfy all objections raised in the Office Action mailed 26 January 2005, and that said invention is patentable as to all said currently amended claims set forth in Amendment C. Therefore, said Joint Inventors urge the Examiner to allow the application for patent as amended herein.

Alternatively, in the event the Examiner does not agree that all currently amended claims set forth in Amendment C are patentable, then said Joint Inventors request that the Examiner grant the application as to such claims as the Examiner finds to be patentable, in light of the foregoing Amendment C and its Remarks, above, and upon the Remarks in support of Amendment B, previously filed herein.

As a final alternative request as to any further Office Action herein, said Joint Inventors request, as stated in Section (C), above, "Alternative Request Under *MPEP* Section 707.07(j)", in the event the Examiner finds no Claim as amended by Amendment C to be allowable as written, that the Examiner draft one or more suitable claims for patentable subject matter. This should be taken as addressing in general any circumstance deemed by the Examiner to require such action, or to render it advisable, especially where necessary to preserve patentability not aptly set forth by said claims, as amended above.

Also in particular, as first requested in Amendment B, p. 77, said Joint Inventors continue to believe that their invention is not obvious as to *Shkedy*, or other prior art cited in the Office Action mailed 17 February 2004, and thus said Joint Inventors have not set forth their claims, as currently amended by Amendment C, as "improvement", or "combination" claims as to such prior art. However, in the event the Examiner disagrees, but believes (as said Joint Inventors certainly believe at the very least) that the present invention is patentable as such an "improvement" or "combination", under 37 *C.F.R.* §1.75(e), if in no other way, then said Joint Inventors alternatively request that such re-drafting of claims be applied by the Examiner toward that end under the aegis of *MPEP* §707.07(j).

Respectfully submitted,

Scott A. Heimermann

Stephen Danforth

Applicants/Joint Inventors, *pro se*

Scott A. Heimermann
c/o Joan Heimermann
West 3124 Hickory Hills Road
Chilton, WI 53014-9767

Certificate of Mailing: I certify that on the date below this document and Transmittal Form as to it will be deposited with the U.S. Postal Service as Express Mail in an envelope addressed to:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Date of Mailing: April 10th, 2005

Scott A. Heimermann